

## United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO
10/023,344	12/17/2001	Hirokazu Miwa	0941.66061 7994	
7590 08/04/2004		EXAMINER		
Patrick G. Burns, Esq.			LAO, LUN YI	
GREER, BURNS & CRAIN, LTD. Suite 2500			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
300 South Wacker Dr.			2673	
Chicago, IL	50606		DATE MAILED: 08/04/2004	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
Advisory Action	10/023,344	MIWA ET AL.	
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Lao Y Lun	2673	
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence add	ress
Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1 condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	al (with appeal fee); or (3) a time	cation. A proper rep ch places the applic	cauon in
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]		
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advevent, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later the ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS 706.07(f).  Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The dathave been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extensions of the shortened (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three models.	risory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the an SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.1 sion and the corresponding amount of the distallutory period for reply originally set in	f the final rejection. E FINAL REJECTION. \$ 136(a) and the appropriate the final Office action; or	Gee MPEP e extension fee tension fee under (2) as set forth in
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).  1  A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant'	s Brief must be filed within the p	period set forth in	
37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CF	R 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal	of the appeal.	
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered be	ecause:		
(a) Method they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search (	(see NOTE below);	
(b) they raise the issue of new matter (see Note I			
(c) they are not deemed to place the application issues for appeal; and/or	•		•
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ling a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.			
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject			
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	I be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment
5. ☑ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☑ request for application in condition for allowance because: See	or reconsideration has been con- ee Continuation Sheet.	sidered but does No	OT place the
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendmen explanation of how the new or amended claims w	$t(s)$ $\boxtimes$ will not be entered or $t$	o)□ will be entered low or appended.	and an
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows	<b>:</b>		
Claim(s) allowed: None.			
Claim(s) objected to: <u>none</u> .			
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-12</u> .			
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:			
8. The drawing correction filed on is a) app	proved or b) disapproved by	the Examiner.	
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Stateme	ent(s)( PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	·	
10. Other:			
		Lun-Yi Lao Primary Examin Lu J	er O

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The new limitation of "so as to increase the driving capability" added in claims 1 and 5 raises new issue...

Continuation of 5. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Karube et al teach each data signal line is simultaneously driven by a plurality of driving devices(101-104, SV1-SV8, 113-116)(see figures 1-2 and column 4, lines 31-50); Murade et al teach data signal line(35) is simultaneously driven by a plurality of driving devices(111, 304, 301) and those driving devices(111, 304, 301) are for controlling each data line(35)(see figure 2) and Zhang et al teach each data signal line(source or drain line of the switch(308) is simultaneously driven by a plurality of driving devices(driverA and driving circuit(B)(see figure 15).